



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,292	02/20/2001	Lorenzo Cicchitelli	169.1990	4229

5514 7590 11/21/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

HUYNH, THU V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/785,292

Applicant(s)

CICCHITELLI ET AL.

Examiner

Thu V Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-18, 28, and 33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 19-27, 29-32 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 02/20/2001 which has priority filed on 02/28/2000.
2. Claims 1-34 are pending in the case.
3. Applicants' attorney, Diane Ragosa, was contacted on 10/31/2003 regarding the restriction below. Claims 1-13, 19-26, 28-31, and 33-34 are elected for examination.

Election/Restrictions

4. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-13, 19-26, 28-31, and 33-34, drawn to method automatically selecting a font from collection of fonts, classified in class 715, subclass 542 (font selection).
 - II. Claims 14-18, 28, and 33, drawn to method automatically selecting a theme from collection of themes, classified in class 715, subclass 522 (layout).

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

5. Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention I has separate utility such as font selection based on specified collection of information and invention II has separate utility such as layout specifications are stored separately from the data to which such specifications are applied. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Art Unit: 2178

6. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
7. During a telephone conversation with Diane Ragosa on 10/31/2003 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of group I (font selection), claims 1-13, 19-26, 28-31, and 33-34. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 14-18, 28, and 32 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.
8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Objections

9. **Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, and 11 are objected to because of the following informalities:**

Regarding independent claim 1, the use of “said collections of fonts” has typographical error because there is only *a collection* of fonts in the preamble. Appropriate correction (“said collection of fonts”) is required.

Regarding independent claim 4, the use of “setting a font of the one or more captions to one of the selected one or more *one* font” has typographical error. Appropriate correction (“one or more fonts”) is required.

Regarding independent claims 4, and dependent claims 6 and 11, the use of “analysing” has typographical error. Appropriate correction (“analyzing”) is required.

Regarding dependent claim 7, the use of “substep” has typographical error. Appropriate correction (“substeps”) is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. **Claims 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Regarding dependent claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, the use of alphabetical, starting with (b), then (c), (d), and (e) to list said information is suggest to discard, since it missing the (a) and raise confusion. Also, the use of “(GPS)” is unclear and indefinite. The acronyms GPS should be spelled out. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

13. **Claims 19-22 and 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rosenberg, US 5,499,366 patented 03/1996.**

Regarding independent claim 19, Rosenberg teaches the steps of:

- automatically selecting one or more fonts from said collections of fonts, based on information associated with one or more texts (Rosenberg, col.11, lines 39-57 and fig.4; suggested fonts is searched based on scale keywords 401A-401C associated with headline, body, or footnote text in a page document); and
- setting the font of the one or more texts to one the selected one or more fonts (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 45-67 and col.11, lines 39-57, one of suggested fonts is applied to headline, body, or footnote text in the page document).

Regarding dependent claim 20, which is dependent on claim 19, teaches the limitations of claim 19 as explained above. Rosenberg teaches wherein the one or more texts have predefined font attributes and said setting step comprises the substep of replacing the predefined font attributes with the set font (Rosenberg, col.11, lines 39-57 and fig.4, Rosenberg teaches graphic user interface includes “default font” as predefined font used to apply for portion of text in the page if the user does not make selection on scales 401A-401C for request of suggested fonts; user

Art Unit: 2178

selects a suggested font solution and activate apply button to apply selected font into the text of a page document).

Regarding dependent claim 21, which is dependent on claim 19, teaches the limitations of claim 19 as explained above. Rosenberg teaches wherein said automatic selection step selects one said font from the collection of fonts (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 1-10, lines 54-61; col.11, lines 47-56; and figure 4; searching fonts in database based on analyzed scale keywords 401A-401B); and said setting step automatically sets the font of the one or more texts to said automatically selected font (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 45-67; col.11, lines 39-57; and figure 4, one of suggested fonts is automatically applied to headline text in the page document, since the constraints “headline” is marked).

Regarding dependent claim 22, which is dependent on claim 19, teaches the limitations of claim 19 as explained above. Rosenberg wherein said setting step comprises the substeps of:

- manually selecting one of said automatically selected fonts by a user (Rosenberg, col.11, lines 39-57 and fig.4, “user selects a suggested font solution” to apply into text);
- setting the font of the one or more objects to said manually selected font (Rosenberg, col.11, lines 39-57 and fig.4, user selects a suggested font solution and activate apply button to apply selected font into text of a page document).

Claim 29 is for an apparatus performing the method of claim 23 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

Claim 32 is for a computer program performing the method of claim 23 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

15. **Claims 1-13, 25-26, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg, US 5,499,366 patented 03/1996 in view of Morag, US 6,324,545 B1, filed 10/1997.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Rosenberg teaches the steps of:

- automatically selecting one or more fonts from said collections of fonts, based on information provided with one or more text in output pages or documents (Rosenberg, abstract; col.11, lines 39-57; figure 4; suggested fonts is searched based on scale keywords 401A-401C); and
- setting the font of the one or more captions to one the selected one or more fonts (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 45-67 and col.11, lines 39-57, one of suggested fonts is applied to particular text portion in the page document).

However, Rosenberg does not explicitly disclose the fonts selected based on information with one or more *image*.

Morag teaches automatically selecting themes (styles for documents) based on information associated with one or more images (Morag, col.1, line 64 – col.2, line 6; col.2, lines 41-50; and col.9, lines 10-13).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Morag and Rosenberg to provide fonts and/or themes based on information associated with one or more documents, image documents, or images, since both Rosenberg and Morag teach automatic provide themes/style for output documents based on output documents' characteristics (see Rosenberg's figures 1 and 3). Rosenberg's design context would have augmented Morag's features in album applications. As Rosenberg disclosed in col.7, lines 45-53.

Regarding dependent claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Rosenberg and Morag teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Refer to the rationale relied reject claim 1, the limitation of "wherein the one or more images comprises one image" is included. The rationale is incorporated herein.

Regarding dependent claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Rosenberg and Morag teach the limitations of claim 2 as explained above. Rosenberg teaches wherein said information may comprise one or more of the following: time of day, location (GPS) information, user provided keywords; and colour information (Rosenberg, fig.4 and col.11, lines 39-57, user

Art Unit: 2178

selects scale keywords 401A-401C for searching fonts; Morag, col.1, line 64 – col.2, line 6, images are arranged based on color and/or time).

Regarding independent claim 4, Rosenberg teaches the steps of:

- analyzing meta-data associated with one or more text documents to determine a key feature amongst the meta-data (Rosenberg, col.9, line 58- col.10, line 35; and col.11, lines 39-54; analyzing scale value to select the most appropriate suggested fonts); and
- searching a library of fonts, each said font having a set of one or more associated key features (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 1-10, lines 54-61; and col.11, lines 47-56; searching fonts in database based on analyzed scale keyword);
- automatically selecting one or more fonts from the font library having an associated said key feature best matching said determined key feature (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 1-61; and col.11, lines 47-56; searching fonts in database based on scale keywords and provide closed match fonts to the user);
- setting a font of the one or more captions to one of the selected one or more font (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 45-67 and col.11, lines 39-57, one of suggested fonts is applied to particular text portion in the document).

However, Rosenberg does not explicitly disclose meta-data associated with one or more *images*.

Morag teaches automatically selecting themes (styles for documents) based on information associated with one or more images (Morag, col.1, line 64 – col.2, line 6; col.2, lines 41-50; and col.9, lines 10-13).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Morag and Rosenberg to provide fonts and/or themes based on information associated with one or more document, image documents, or images, since both Rosenberg and Morag teach automatic provide themes/style for output documents based on output documents' characteristics (see Rosenberg's figures 1 and 3). Rosenberg's design context would have augmented Morag's features in album applications. As Rosenberg disclosed in col.7, lines 45-53.

Regarding dependent claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Rosenberg and Morag teach the limitations of claim 4 as explained above. Rosenberg teaches wherein said key feature includes one of the following: (a) same date and time within a particular range; (b) same date and location; (c) same keyword matching; (d) same date and keyword; and (e) same colour similarities (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 1-61; and col.11, lines 47-56; searching fonts in database based on scale keywords and provide closed match fonts to the user; Morag, col.1, line 64 – col.2, line 6, images are arranged based key feature such as color and/or time).

Regarding dependent claim 6, which is dependent on claim 4, Rosenberg and Morag teach the limitations of claim 4 as explained above. Rosenberg further teaches inserting and displaying the one or more captions associated with the one or more images in a predefined default font, prior to said analyzing step (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 62-67, a page includes text and associated graphics; and fig.4 Rosenberg teaches graphic user interface includes "default font" as predefined font used to apply for portion of text in the page if the user does not make selection

Art Unit: 2178

on scale keywords 401A-401C; Morag, col.7, lines 15-25; default parameter values are used if no instruction are provided).

Regarding dependent claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Rosenberg and Morag teach the limitations of claim 6 as explained above. Rosenberg teaches wherein the setting step comprises the substeps of:

- replacing the predefined default font with one of the selected one or more fonts (Rosenberg, col.11, lines 39-56, one of suggested fonts is applied to the text instead of default font);
- displaying the one or more captions associated with the one or more images in the replaced font (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 62-67, a page includes text and associated graphics; col.11, lines 39-56; and figures 10A-10F, one of suggested fonts is applied to the text instead of default font on a page document which includes graphics).

Regarding dependent claim 8, which is dependent on claim 4, Rosenberg and Morag teach the limitations of claim 4 as explained above. Rosenberg further teaches inserting and displaying the one or more captions associated with the one or more images in one of selected on or more font (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 62-67, a page includes text and associated graphics; col.11, lines 39-56 and figures 10A-10F, one of suggested fonts is applied to the text of a page document which includes graphics).

Regarding dependent claim 9, which is dependent on claim 6, the combination of Rosenberg and Morag teaches providing suggested fonts based on metadata associated with one or more images as explained above. Rosenberg teaches graphic user interface includes “default font” as predefined font used to apply for portion of text in the page if a user does not make selection on scale keywords 401A-401C and Morag, col.7, lines 15-25 teaches default parameter values are used if no instruction are provided. These suggest that default font is used for text captions if information used to select fonts is not provide or unable to find as claimed “wherein if said selecting steps is unable to find meta-data associated with the one or more images, the one or more captions remain in the predefined default font”.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Morag and Rosenberg’s teaching to provide a default font if meta-data associated with on or more images unable to find, since if there is no suggested fonts are found based on metadata associated with one or more image, a default font is used.

Regarding dependent claim 10, which is dependent on claim 6, the combination of Rosenberg and Morag teaches providing suggested fonts based on metadata associated with one or more images as explained above. Rosenberg teaches graphic user interface includes “default font” as predefined font used to apply for portion of text in the page if a user does not make selection on scale keywords 401A-401C and solutions that do not satisfy rejection constraints are eliminated (Rosenberg, abstract). Morag, col.7, lines 15-25 teaches default parameter values are used if no instruction are provided. These suggest that default font is used for text captions if solutions that do not meet the search criteria or unable to find the best matching key feature as

Art Unit: 2178

claimed “wherein if said searching steps feature is unable to find the best matching key feature, the one or more captions remain in the predefined default font”.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Morag and Rosenberg’s teaching to provide a default font if unable to find a best matching key feature, since if there is no suggested fonts are found based on the searching, a default font is used.

Regarding dependent claim 11, which is dependent on claim 4, Rosenberg and Morag teach the limitations of claim 4 as explained above. Rosenberg teaches wherein the one or more images comprise a plurality of images (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 62-67, a page includes text and associated graphics); and step analyzing step comprises analyzing meta-data associated with the plurality of texts to find a most common key feature amongst the meta-data (Rosenberg, col.10, lines 1-37); and said selecting step comprises selecting one of fonts of the font library having an associate said key feature best matching the common key feature (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 1-61; and col.11, lines 47-56; searching fonts in database based on scale keywords and provide closed match fonts to the user).

Morag teaches wherein the one or more images comprise a plurality of images (Morag, col.4, lines 1-24 and col.7, lines 25 – col.8, lines 25 and col.13, lines 15-20) analyzing step comprises analyzing meta-data associated with the plurality of images to find a most common key feature amongst the meta-data (Morag, col.5, lines 14-15; col.7, lines 25 – col.8, lines 25 and col.13, lines 15-20); selecting step comprises selecting one of themes of the themes library having

Art Unit: 2178

an associate said key feature best matching the common key feature (Morag, col.2, lines 21-50 and col.13, lines 15-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Morag and Rosenberg to provide fonts and/or themes based on information associated with one or more document, image documents, or images, since both Rosenberg and Morag teach automatic provide themes/style for output documents based on output documents' characteristics (see Rosenberg's figures 1 and 3). Rosenberg's design context would have augmented Morag's features in album applications. As Rosenberg disclosed in col.7, lines 45-53.

Regarding dependent claim 12, which is dependent on claim 4, Rosenberg and Morag teach the limitations of claim 4 as explained above. Rosenberg teaches wherein said automatic selection step selects one said font of the font library having an associated said key feature best matching the said determined key feature (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 1-10, lines 54-61; col.11, lines 47-56; and figure 4; searching fonts in database based on analyzed scale keywords 401A-401B) and said setting step automatically sets a font of the one or more captions to said selected font (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 45-67; col.11, lines 39-57; and figure 4, one of suggested fonts is automatically applied to headline text in the page document, since the constraints "headline" is marked).

Regarding dependent claim 13, which is dependent on claim 4, Rosenberg and Morag teach the limitations of claim 4 as explained above. Rosenberg teaches wherein said setting step comprises the substeps of:

- manually selecting one of said automatically selected fonts by a user (Rosenberg, col.11, lines 39-57 and fig.4, “user selects a suggested font solution” to apply into text); and
- setting the font of the one or more captions to said manually selected font (Rosenberg, col.11, lines 39-57 and fig.4, user selects a suggested font solution and activate apply button to apply selected font into text of a page document).

Claims 25 and 26 are for an apparatus performing the method of claims 1 and 4, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 30 and 31 are for a computer program performing the method of claims 1 and 4, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

16. **Claims 23, 29 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg, US 5,499,366 patented 03/1996 in view of Maddalozzo, Jr. et al., US 5,787,254, patented 07/1998.**

Regarding independent claim 23, Rosenberg teaches the steps of:

- automatically selecting one or more fonts from said collections of fonts, based on information associated with one or more texts (Rosenberg, col.11, lines 39-57 and fig.4;

Art Unit: 2178

suggested fonts is searched based on scale keywords 401A-401C associated with headline, body, or footnote text in a page document); and

- setting the font of the one or more texts to one the selected one or more fonts (Rosenberg, col.7, lines 45-67 and col.11, lines 39-57, one of suggested fonts is applied to headline, body, or footnote text in the page document).

Rosenberg does not explicitly disclose the texts are hyperlink texts. However, Rosenberg teaches fonts are automatically selected based on characteristics associated with several kinds of text, such as headline, body, and footnote text.

Maddalozzo teaches changing font of hypertext links that indicate a latency attribute characteristic (Maddalozzo, col.10, lines 50-52).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Maddalozzo and Rosenberg to automatically selecting one or more fonts from said collections of fonts, based on information associated with one or more hyperlink texts, since it would have provided suggested fonts for also hyperlink texts which are one kind of texts.

Claim 29 is for an apparatus performing the method of claim 23 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 34 is for a computer program performing the method of claim 23 and is rejected under the same rationale.

17. **Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg**

Art Unit: 2178

view of Maddalozzo as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of Morag, US 6,324,545 B1, filed 10/1997.

Regarding dependent claim 24, which is dependent on claim 23, Rosenberg and Maddalozzo teaches the limitations of claim 23 as explained above. Rosenberg does not explicitly teach wherein said information comprises the type and content of the hyperlink texts. However, Rosenberg teaches information comprise the type of the texts (Rosenberg, fig.4, “informal”, “formal”, etc. and “headline”, “body”, ect.).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rosenberg teaching to include information comprises the type of the hyperlink texts, since fonts are selected based on the hyperlink texts’ characteristics.

However, Rosenberg does not explicitly disclose that information comprise the content of the texts.

Morag teaches analyzing content, weight, color, time, etc. of one or more images to automatically selecting themes for a page document (Morag, col.1, line 64 – col.2, line 6; col.2, lines 41-50; and col.9, lines 10-13).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Morag’s teaching into Rosenberg and Maddalozzo’s teaching to provide fonts based on content of the hyperlink texts, since content is one of information is analyzed besides other information such as type to automatically select suggested fonts providing to the user.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

Art Unit: 2178

disclosure.

Sonnenschein, US 5500931, patented 03/1996, teaches system for applying font style changes to multi-script text.

Hui et al., US 6237101 B1, filed 10/1997, teaches multimedia application using flashpix file format.

Cordell et al., US 5893915, filed 04/1996, teaches local font face selection for remote electronic document browsing.


Lee et al., US 6466970 B1, filed 01/1999, teaches system and method for collecting and analyzing information about content requested in a network environment.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu V Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-9774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306. The phone number for After Final communications is (703) 746-7238, for Non-Official/Draft is (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9000.

TVH
November 13, 2003


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER